04-29-04

433.015

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

TINE HOLLAND FRIMANN

Serial No.: 10/601,719 Filed: June 23, 2003

For: A VACCINEWITH A PRESERVATIVE:

475 Park Avenue New York, N.Y. 10016 April 28, 2004

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

"Express Mail" mailing label No. 2004

I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Er press Mail Pest Office to Addressee" service under 27 CaR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Ess 1450 Alexandria, VA 22315-1450

Responsive to the office action of April 2, 2004, Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in view of the remarks presented herein.

The claims in the application are claims 1 to 12, no other claims having been presented.

The Examiner has required restriction between claims 1 to 8 drawn to a vaccine formulation and claims 9 to 12 drawn to a base stock solution of excipients for the preparation of vaccines containing a preservative. The Examiner is of the opinion that the two inventions are unrelated since the vaccine of group I is used to treat or prevent infection while the base stock of group II is a diluent that has no preventive properties. Therefore, the Examiner deems that restriction is proper.

Applicant respectfully traverses this ground of rejection since it is believed that

the two allegedly distinct inventions are related. Claims 1 to 8 are drawn to a vaccine

comprising an immunogen, a preservative and excipients wherein the preservative is a

combination of at least two paraben esters and 2-phenoxyethanol. Claims 9 to 10 are

drawn to the base stock solution or preservative useful in claims 1 to 8 wherein the stock

solution consists of excipents for the preparation of vaccines comprising an aluminum

hydroxide gel and a combination of at least two paraben esters and 2-phenoxyethanol.

Therefore, it is deemed that the inventions are related. However, in order to be fully

responsive, Applicant elects with traverse the invention of claims 1 to 8.

Since the first office action was merely a restriction requirement, Applicant

requests a prompt examination on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

Muserlian, Lucas and Mercanti

Charles A. Muserlian, 19,683

Attorney for Applicant

Tel. # (212) 661-8000

CAM:ds Enclosures

ħ

2